

REMARKS

Status Summary

In this Amendment, no claims are canceled, and claims 29-40 are added. Therefore, upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-40 will be pending.

Objections to the Specification

The specification was objected to as failing to contain the headings specified by 37 C.F.R. § 1.77(b). Appropriate amendments have been made to the specification. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objections to the specification be withdrawn.

Objections to the Abstract

The abstract was objected to as containing the word "disclosed." The Abstract has been corrected as requested. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the Abstract be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4-5, 7, and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,802,518 to Karaev et al. (hereinafter, "Karaev") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,501,832 to Saylor et al. (hereinafter, "Saylor").

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Karaev in view of Saylor as applied to claims 1-2, 4-5, 7 and 10 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,157,924 to Austin (hereinafter, "Austin").

Claims 6, 8, 9, and 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Karaev in view of Saylor, as applied to claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 10 in further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2002/0184131 A1 to Gatto (hereinafter, "Gatto").

Claims 14-28 were rejected as unpatentable over Saylor in view of Gatto.

Each of these rejections is separately and respectfully traversed.

The present invention, for example as claimed in amended independent claims 1, 14, and 17, includes methods, systems, and knowledge switches for defining and distributing information alerts regarding security events to intended recipients and wherein the information alerts include directives for instructing the intended recipients on action to be taken in response to the security events. In independent claim 1, a knowledge switch configurator includes functionality for allowing an administrator to define event information regarding a security event, an information alert to be associated with the event information, and content to be included in the information alert. The content includes a directive for instructing the intended recipient regarding action to be taken in response to the security event. A logic kernel receives event information regarding a security event for which an information alert has been defined, locates the corresponding information alert, and distributes the information alert, including the directive, to intended recipients.

In one example described in the specification, the security event is an airport security event that occurs when the passport id of an airline passenger does not match identification information on the ticket presented to the gate agent. (See page 16, lines 13-20 of the present specification.) As described in the paragraph beginning on page

11, line 4 of the present specification, the knowledge switch includes a knowledge switch configurator that allows a user or administrator to configure the logic kernel of the knowledge switch using templates. One such template is the event template illustrated in Figure 3. In the event template of Figure 3, the administrator defines event information to be provided by a gate agent in response to an airport security event. In this example, the gate agent can either speak "ticket problem" or enter the keypad command "123" to inform the knowledge switch of a ticket problem event. The template illustrated in Figure 3, also includes content to be included in an information alert to be delivered to gate agents and to the FBI in response to the security event. In the illustrated example, the content includes a directive that instructs the recipient to acquire a photograph, ticket number, and passport id of the passenger who presents a ticket with a passport id that does not match the passenger's passport. Finally, the template illustrated in Figure 3 allows the administrator to define different information alerts to be sent to different recipients. In the illustrated example, gate agents receive different messages than the FBI.

Similar amendments have been made to independent claims 14 and 17, which specify mechanisms for allowing an administrator to define security event information and information alert content, including directives, to be automatically delivered to intended recipients.

There is absolutely no disclosure, teaching, or suggestion, in any of the cited references, when taken individually, or when combined, of a method, a system, or a knowledge switch that includes logic for defining and automatically distributing information alerts to intended recipients, where the information alerts include directives

containing information on action to be taken by the intended recipients in response to the security events.

Karaev is directed to an information delivery system and method that allows distribution of investment research reports to investors and investment advisors. For example, Karaev states:

The invention is ideally suited for providing investment research reports to investors and investor advisors. (See column 4, lines 66 through column 5, line 1 of Karaev.)

From this passage, Karaev is directed to delivering financial information to an investors. Karaev has nothing to do with detecting security events or distributing information alerts including directives to intended recipients.

In paragraph 6 of the Official Action, the Examiner correctly notes that Karaev discloses the use of templates. However, the use of templates in Karaev is markedly different from the use of templates or the knowledge switch configurator in the claims of the present application. For example, in column 4, lines 47-65, Karaev discloses that a web server accesses template forms written in a research access language (RAL) to determine how to display HTML pages to a user or class of users. Thus, according to Karaev, the templates only allow definition of the format in which information is presented to the user. There is absolutely no teaching or suggestion of using templates or a knowledge switch configurator to define security event information or content of information alerts, not to mention directives, to be distributed to intended recipients.

Saylor likewise fails to teach a method, a system, or a knowledge switch that allows an administrator to define security event identification information usable for

detecting security events, information alerts corresponding to the security events, or directives to be included in the information alerts. Saylor is directed to a system that allows users to access the Internet using voice codes. Accessing the Internet using voice codes relates to a new web browsing method, rather than distributing information alerts including directives to intended recipients.

Paragraph 9 of the Official Action indicates that Saylor teaches a hierarchical system of knowledge switches as claimed in claim 14. Applicants respectfully disagree. As discussed above, Saylor is directed to a new Internet access method using voice codes. There is no teaching or suggestion in Saylor of distributing information alerts to intended recipients using a hierarchy of knowledge switches, as claimed in independent claim 14.

Accordingly for all of the reasons stated above, Saylor fails to teach the invention as claimed, even when combined with the disclosure of Karaev.

Austin is directed to systems, methods, and computer program products for delivering information to users in a preferred medium. The stated purpose of the system disclosed in Austin is to provide alternatives to paper-based mail that allow the same level of personalization as paper-based mail. (See column 2, lines 3-6 of Austin.) The disclosure of Austin differs from the invention as claimed in the independent claims of the present application in a number of respects. First, the examples in Austin relate only to distributing financial and marketing information, rather than distributing information alerts to intended recipients. Second, Austin requires a user to send a request for specific information, rather than automatically delivering information to the intended recipients. (See block 110 in Figure 6A of Austin.) Third, Austin does not

disclose delivering information including directives instructing users on how to respond to a security event. Thus, the disclosure of Austin, even when combined with the disclosure of Karaev and Saylor, fails to teach the invention claimed in the independent claims of the present application.

Gatto is directed to a system for measuring, analyzing, and tracking performance of security analysts' earnings estimates and recommendations. (See Abstract of Gatto.) The term "security" as used in Gatto refers to a marketable interest in a company. There is absolutely no teaching or suggestion in Gatto of allowing a user or an administrator to define security event identification information used in detecting security events, information alerts to be automatically distributed to intended recipients in response to detection of a security event, or directives to be included in the information alerts. As stated above, Gatto is directed to a financial analysis method and is not relevant to the present invention.

The Examiner correctly notes that paragraphs 202 and 203 on page 16 of Gatto disclose a mechanism for automatically delivering alerts to users. However, the alerts discussed in Gatto relate only to financial conditions, such as when a model is applied to a company's financial performance and the performance exceeds the calculated average. (See paragraph 202 of Gatto). Detecting financial information is markedly different from the claims in the present application, which now recite methods, systems, and knowledge switches for defining and automatically distributing information alerts, where the information alerts include directives on how a recipient should respond to a security event. The purpose of the financial alerts described in paragraphs 202 and 203

of Gatto are to allow a user to make his or her own decisions regarding financial analysts' reports. For example, Gatto states:

The present invention when applied to stock estimates may serve to alert and inform the user of events that may persuade a user to purchase a particular stock. According to one embodiment, a website operator using the software of the present invention may offer a subscription service based on issuance of alerts. Other issues may be made of the enhanced composite opposites. (See paragraph 203 of Gatto.)

From this passage, Gatto merely discloses a system that delivers financial information to users and allows the users to make their own financial decisions. In contrast, the information alerts claimed in the independent claims of the present application include directives on action to be taken with regard to a security event. Thus, the disclosure of Gatto, even combined with that of Karaev and/or Saylor fails to teach the invention claimed in any of the claims of the subject U.S. patent application.

In addition to the positions stated above, claim 17 recites defining different information alert delivery modes for different times. In other words, an end user can specify different mechanisms for receiving an information alert based on the end user's schedule. Paragraphs 202 and 203 of Gatto were cited in the Official Action as disclosing this limitation. However, Applicants disagree. The only mention of time-based criteria in paragraphs 202 and 203 of Gatto relates to allowing a user to define an alert for a particular time period. For example, Gatto states:

Alert duration may also be defined where the user may select a time period of activation. For example, the user may select to activate a particular alert for one fiscal quarter or for different fiscal periods within a fiscal year. (See paragraph 202 of Gatto.)

From this passage, Gatto merely teaches performing financial analysis for different time periods associated with a company. There is absolutely no teaching or suggestion of allowing a user to specify different modes for delivering information to the user based on the user's schedule.

Thus, because none of the references cited in the Official Action, when taken individually, or when combined, teach a method, a system, or a knowledge switch that allows an administrator to define information for identifying security events, information alerts to be associated with the security events, where the information alerts include a directive that informs intended recipients on how to respond to the security events, it is respectfully submitted that all of the rejections of the claims as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 should now be withdrawn.

New Claims

New claims 29-40 are proposed to be added. Support for claims 29-40 appears, for example, in Figure 3 and on page 16, lines 13-20 and page 22, line 24 through page 23, line 5 of the present specification. Since new claims 29-40 each depend from one of the independent claims discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are patentable for the same reasons that the claims discussed above are patentable, as well as for the features recited in these claims.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in proper condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited.

If any small matter should remain outstanding after the Patent Examiner has had an opportunity to review the above Remarks, the Patent Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned patent attorney in order to resolve these matters and avoid the issuance of another Official Action.

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with the filing of this correspondence to Deposit Account No. 50-0426.

Respectfully submitted,

JENKINS, WILSON & TAYLOR, P.A.

Date: May 28, 2004

By: 

Gregory A. Hunt
Registration No. 41,085
Customer No. 25297

1381/3/2 GAH/sed

Enclosures